



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SPECIAL STUDIES COMMITTEE TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2007

Minutes

The Special Studies Committee of the Carmel Plan Commission met at 6:00 PM in the Caucus Rooms of Carmel City Hall on Tuesday, March 6, 2007.

Members present: Kevin Heber and Susan Westermeier. Leo Dierckman was in attendance as an Ex-Officio member.

Christine Barton-Holmes and David Littlejohn attended the meeting on behalf of the Department of Community Services.

The Special Studies Committee considered the following items:

1. Docket No. 06120022 ADLS Amend: Carmel Total Fitness – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for new sign signage.

The site is located at 820 W 122nd St and is zoned M-3.

Filed by Lisa Bohn for LB&A Sign Management.

Lisa Bohn, LB&A Sign Management, and Dan Klausner, new owner of Carmel Total Fitness appeared before the Committee on behalf of the applicant.

The applicant is requesting approval for a new wall sign on the building located at 820 West 122nd Street. Both signs are in compliance with the Sign Ordinance as it relates to square footage and the height of the signs.

Dan Klausner addressed the Committee and explained some of the changes that have taken place at the facility. The plan is to have halo lighting on the signs. The Carmel Fitness facility was purchased by Mr. Klausner in June, 2006 and the business has grown over 40% in the last few months. Current plans are to significantly improve the landscaping—now pretty barren. The new owners are committed to providing a great facility for people's wellness in the Carmel area. The proposed signage is badly needed.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: The two signs do comply with the Carmel Sign Ordinance. If each of the signs has a halo light around it, it would be considered as multiple signs and would require variances for the number of signs. As stated, the Dept. would like to see a different type of sign, maybe individual letters. The Dept. would be glad to work with the

petitioner.

Mr. Klausner clarified that the lighting would be external.

Susan Westermeier commented that the Committee usually goes with the Department's analysis and recommendation. The sign is not as good as it could be, but it is OK.

David Littlejohn said that the sign is designed as a vinyl print on top of an aluminum piece of metal. The Department could consider the sign to be a box or cabinet sign and would not be in favor. The Dept. likes to see individual letters.

Leo Dierckman noted that he generally prefers individual lettering. This particular area is currently in transition, and with the upgrade in landscaping, it will look much better.

Dan Klausner explained that the sign notes that the facility is a Pilate Studio, a dance company, and massage therapy in addition to their main focus—"fitness." The only way to provide that information without going through the variance process was to do it in the sign as presented.

Lisa Bohn said they had explored a cabinet sign—not real popular here—and thought about back-lighting the sign.

Dan Klausner said the lighting would be facing down or back-lit, whichever the Committee prefers.

David Littlejohn commented that the Department would prefer down-lighting—shielded.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 06120022 ADLS Amend, Carmel Total Fitness Signage**, with the commitment of down-lighting and shielded, seconded by Kevin Heber, **APPROVED 3-0**.

2. Docket No. 07020011 ADLS Amend: Meridian Design Center – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new sign package.

The site is located at 12955 Old Meridian St and is zoned OM/MU.

Filed by Steve Granner for Bose McKinney & Evans LLP.

Paul Reis, attorney, Bose McKinney & Evans appeared before the Committee representing JKB Properties, LLC. The petitioner met with the BZA Hearing Officer this evening prior to the Committee meeting and obtained a variance to increase the size of the address numbers to 12 inches and also received a variance for the calculation of the sign area. Only one sign is affected that is being shown this evening, but it does affect the overall calculation for sign area.

An information booklet was distributed prior to the meeting. There is an existing ground sign that is being removed. There are also some very large, blue awnings currently on the building; those will be replaced by smaller, black awnings. The information booklet shows pictures of the proposed sign and the gooseneck accent lighting that is proposed.

The sign criteria submitted will guide future sign packages for this building as tenants come in. Some of the highlights are that every sign for tenants will have individual, illuminated channel letters. The sign faces will be white with black returns, except for logos and except for the sign over the entrance to the building. There is a potential tenant called “Young Chefs Academy” and there are two different sign designs—this would be the only sign allowed to have colors. The sign area is restricted to 32 square feet; the variance obtained allows for the signage for Young Chefs—it is an arch that matches the line of the arch. The signage will be on one line, again with the exception of the entrance signage, although the logo could be on a different line, but there will be no stacked lettering of the sign.

The Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV) has re-located to this center—should they decide that they want a color sign in the future, they have asked that the “BMV” as shown be considered their logo. Also, there is signage, an awning, and lighting to the rear—there is a significant parking area behind the building and the tenants, particularly the employees, will be encouraged to use the rear entrances.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: The Department is recommending approval, aside from the main tenant—Young Chefs Academy—every other letter is a different color and the Department would recommend that the Young Chefs choose one color for the sign, with the exception of the logo.

Paul Reis responded that there is nothing in the Sign Ordinance that regulates colors. The tenant or owner should have the flexibility to add colors as desired. Only one tenant in this center is asking for flexibility on colors—it may not be Young Chefs, it may be someone else. For some companies, color is a very important thing; when it is a logo, obviously it is important. Obviously, the smaller tenants—“B” tenants—will have a consistent white face, but a little color can be interesting and it is not abusing the color—it is not that large a sign. Paul Reis asked the Committee to consider flexibility versus rigidity on the choice of color palate.

Susan Westermeier said that this has come up before and there has been discussion regarding limiting the color palate to three colors.

Paul Reis responded that this is subjective, there is nothing in the Ordinance that says signs should be limited to five colors, three colors, or one color. There is no legal standard that requires that. The Committee can request the three colors, and we will try to work around it.

Susan explained that the Committee has compromised before when a petitioner has had five colors—they have been asked to limit colors to three of their choice, not the Committee’s choice.

Paul Reis said the Young Chefs Academy would like to see their sign as a different color, every other letter.

David Littlejohn clarified that the original sign package had lettering on the awning and no wall sign. This proposal will be adding wall signs and changing out the awnings. The Department would agree that it does look better, but for the main tenant, they could choose one color per word or one color per sign.

Paul Reis reiterated that the different colors, every other letter, would be one sign only for the main tenant at the entrance—all others would be white with black returns.

David Littlejohn noted that in the past, Committees have requested that letters do not change colors.

Kevin Heber had no strong feelings about the signage.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 07020011 ADLS Amend, Meridian Design Center Signage, limited to three different colors of the tenants' choice plus black for the main entrance sign only**; all other signs would be white with black returns, seconded by Kevin Heber, **APPROVED** 3-0.

3. Docket No. 07020015 ADLS Amend: Majors Sports Café – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new wall signs.

The site is located at 2293 E 116th St and is zoned B-8.

Filed by Jim Johnson for Signs by RSG.

Robert Carlson appeared before the Committee representing the RSG Sign Company. The petitioner is requesting approval for wall signs located at 2293 East 116th Street within the Merchants Pointe Retail Center.

In response to questions from Leo Dierckman, Mr. Carlson stated that the signs have already been erected on the site. Leo said that is a big “negative” for the petitioner.

Robert Carlson said the paperwork was submitted and signs contracted for, but instructions were not given to actually erect the signs—that was done in error.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: The petitioner had requested a sign permit; the petitioner was then informed that they would have to file for an ADLS Amendment prior to the permit. The sign contractor said he thought it was already approved for installation and did install the sign. The petitioner/franchisee is in Minnesota.

The sign does comply with the Sign Ordinance; it was erected without approval. The awnings shown in the picture provided are green—the actual awnings are red to match the lettering in the sign. The former ground sign is being removed; approval would be for one wall sign only.

Kevin Heber stated no issues.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 07020015 ADLS Amend Majors Sports Café Wall Sign** with red awnings (the former ground sign is being removed,) seconded by Kevin Heber, **APPROVED** 3-0.

4. Docket No. 07020016 ADLS Amend: Parkwood Crossing West – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new signs.

The site is located at 250 W 96th St and is zoned PUD.
Filed by Aaron Reynolds for Duke Realty

Aaron Reynolds, development search for Duke Construction appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Rodney Rhinehart, construction project manager for Parkwood West.

Parkwood West received initial ADLS approval in 2000. At the time, language was included in the PUD that Parkwood would come back before the Committee for signage approval as the center developed. The informational packets indicate the proposed location of the two entry signs—they more or less follow the radii around the entry.

There are three tenant signs with the actual tenants labeled. The signs are consistent with the signs in the Parkwood Crossing development.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: The signs do meet their PUD and match the other signs in the center. The signs were basically approved in 2000 with the Rezone and it was stated that the petitioner would return for final approval.

At this time, the petitioner is requesting approval for the ground-mounted, tenant sign labeling the tenants within the building, and the two entry signs that identify the Center as part of Parkwood West. The petitioner will return to the Committee for building signage that is mounted on the exterior of the buildings. Without knowing the tenants, the petitioner must return.

There are a total of five signs—two entry, three tenant/leasing signs.

Leo Dierckman moved for approval of **Docket No. 07020016 ADLS Amend, Parkwood Crossing West Signage**, seconded by Kevin Heber, **APPROVED 3-0**.

5. Docket No. 07020021 ADLS Amend: Carmel Dr. Harris Bank – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new signs.

The site is located at 568 E Carmel Dr and is zoned B-8.

Filed by Nancy Long for A-1 Expeditors.

6. Docket No. 07020022 ADLS Amend: The Corner Harris Bank – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new signs.

The site is located at 568 E Carmel Dr and is zoned B-8.

Filed by Nancy Long for A-1 Expeditors.

Note: Items 5 and 6 were heard together. Clarification: Docket No. 07020022 ADLS Amend is located at the southwest corner of 116th Street and Westfield Boulevard, known as 11592 Westfield Boulevard.

Nancy Long, A-1 Expeditors appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Corey Fox, Harris Bank, and Ed Constant, Icon Identity Solutions—the Sign

Company. Harris Bank has purchased the First National Bank & Trust as of May 1, 2007 and will be converting the signage at the 11592 Westfield Boulevard and 568 East Carmel Drive locations.

The petitioner is simply removing the First National Bank & Trust sign and replacing with Harris Bank and their logo at each location. The East Carmel Drive location will have additional landscaping, no higher than six feet. The directional signs are three feet tall. The wall signs are channel set letters. The ATM signage is 2.9 square feet. There was a question regarding the blue that appeared on the signs—the blue was from the previous First National Bank and will no longer appear—the Harris Bank colors are gray and red; the background on the ATM is white.

The Westfield Boulevard signage is mirrored to the East Carmel Drive. No monument signage was requested, the directional signs are three feet, per the Ordinance, the suspended ATM is three square feet, and there are no landscaping issues at this site.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: The petitioner has addressed all of the Department's Comments and the signs at both locations now comply with the Ordinance. At this time, the Department recommends consideration for approval.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 07020022 ADLS Amend, Harris Bank signage as presented**, located at 11592 Westfield Boulevard, and **Docket No. 07020021 ADLS Amend, Harris Bank signage** located at 568 East Carmel Drive, seconded by Kevin Heber, **APPROVED** 3-0.

7. Docket No. 07010009 DP/ADLS: Sunrise of Carmel

The applicant seeks to construct a 4-story, 150,802 square foot independent and assisted living facility on 4.10 acres.

The site is located at the northeast corner of Old Meridian Street and US 31, and is zoned B6 within the US 31 Overlay.

Filed by Mary Solada of Bingham McHale LLP for Sunrise Development, Inc.

8. Docket No. 07020006 Zoning Waiver: Sunrise of Carmel

The applicant seeks a waiver to increase the Floor Area Ratio from 0.70 to 0.84, a 20% increase, in the construction of a 4-story continuing care facility with underground parking.

The site is located at the northeast corner of Old Meridian Street and US 31, and is zoned B6 within the US 31 Overlay.

Filed by Mary Solada of Bingham McHale LLP for Sunrise Development, Inc

Note: Items 7 and 8 were heard together.

Mary Solada, attorney, Bingham McHale, LLP, appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Annmarie Varga, land planner with Bingham, McHale; Tim Hedges, Sunrise Properties, Jack Scott, architect with BeeryRio; and Ashton Fritz, Schneider Engineering.

Mary Solada reported that the three comments most heard at public hearing were architectural
S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/SpecialStudies/2007/mar06

design, (vary some of the materials, pattern and shapes,) what the interior view would be, and orientation of the improvements to the site.

There was also a question as to how far the building is from the edge of right-of-way line of US 31—the answer is 90 feet. The footprint of the building has not changed. By way of explanation, there is a low-lying area where the right-of-way ends and drops off almost like a ditch. There is a 30-foot greenspace as a part of the Ordinance, but the ditch is part of the State Highway. The closest building edge is 90 feet from the right-of-way.

Tim Hedges addressed the Committee and referred to the photos in the back of the booklet that contain typical interiors. A notebook was circulated that contained both exterior and interior views, but the themes are similar in that Sunrise wants to offer a very gracious and elegant environment both on the outside and the inside. One of the trademarks of the Sunrise facility is that upon walking in the front door, you walk into a two-story atrium with a grand staircase—it invokes a very residential feel and is a lead-in to other common areas in the building. The assisted living is approximately 40% common space—common dining room, common living room, ice cream/bistro that serves snacks 24 hours/day, libraries, sitting areas, porches—both outside and interior sun porches. There is a lot of community space within the building for sitting, reading, watching TV, etc. The residential areas are broken into “neighborhoods,” like a cul-de-sac in a sub-division—there is a cluster of rooms around a decorated, furnished end of the hallway that is also a place where residents can congregate with immediate neighbors as opposed to going into the main common areas of the building.

Sunrise builds, owns, and operates its facilities and has in-house interior design. A lot of the design elements that the architects work on work hand-in-hand with what the interior designers do to create an environment that is pleasing to the residents and also functional, i.e. handrails in the hallways that do not look institutional.

It does not matter the location, Lincoln Park, Connecticut Avenue, or Carmel, the spaces are similar and functional for the program being provided for the residents. The theme in the residential wings can be altered depending on the community where Sunrise locates. A lot of attention goes into the details.

Jake Scott, Architect, Beery/Rio referred to the site plan—the independent living is adjacent to U.S. 31, the assisted living is 90 degrees on the opposite side. Comments from public hearing indicated that we needed to work on the build-to line to develop an urban face to be presented on the 90-foot setback line. The site plan reinforces the southwest corner and allows the extension of the urban face/urban wall and makes variations from the projected mass back to the areas towards the middle. The other part is, that it is not just a direct mirror around what is the center section—it does make some differences.

Jake Scott enumerated some of the ways the design has responded to Commission comments. The height of the cornice has been increased and is more according to scale with the building. The mass to the left is pulled forward and to the right pulled forward and allows for variations in the urban wall and the height as well that brings out gables, or hips in the roof. The openings on the porch have been narrowed; Flemish bond patterning is proposed in each of the masses.

There is a difference in the color of the masonry that will be complementary to the pre-cast lentils at the openings—porches, windows and detailing. The windows are typically six feet high, six feet wide for maximum light on the inside—windows at the top in the recessed areas also have an opportunity for a small transom that would help highlight. There are metal railings at the porches and other metal works such as a decorative grille at the base for openings into the garage area.

Mary Solada commented that at this point, the petitioner is looking for Committee input that can be used for more specificity/guidelines in the development of this project.

Department Comments, Christine Barton-Holmes: This project is at a real gateway location in the US 31 corridor—it is not within the Old Meridian District, but there is some overlap. The City has envisioned a building that would provide transition between the more commercial, institutional look of the offices and what is going to go in on Old Meridian—the Centex project, etc. Most of what is being seen is not quite there yet. The west elevation appears to be more urban.

Some of the issues are highlighted in the Department Report. Lighting—there is a concern with balancing light pollution and safety. It appears that the dryvit has been removed and that is no longer an issue. One of the suggestions at public hearing was a roof garden, enclosed atrium, or vegetable garden—particularly within the assisted living where residents will be able to enjoy some form of nature, whether they are actually outside or whether it is immediately adjacent with no possibility of bodily harm.

It looks as if the roof will really be a key element, whether gabled or hipped, the Department recognizes that this is important, but it looks as if there is some room for compromise for providing a rooftop garden amenity or adding a more urban look which is more flat than hipped or gabled roofs—this might be something we could split between the buildings to provide some sort of design compromise.

The Department is recommending that this item be continued to the March 29, 2007 meeting of the Special Studies Committee at 6:00 PM for further review. In the interim, the Department would be happy to meet with the petitioner.

In response to questions from Leo Dierckman regarding the difference in elevation on the computer renderings, Jack Scott said the difference is due to the half-submerged, recessed garage

Susan Westermeier: So, what I see here, I will see on every building, all sides? All the bullets, all the changes, everything goes all the way around?

Jake Scott responded in the affirmative.

Leo said he did not understand the concern about the roof garden—it is an internal, problematic issue relative to the operator and not necessarily...if I could see it from the outside, it would be a design element that would be a concern, but I don't know if it would be seen anyway. I don't know if we want to dictate to the petitioner whether or not they need to spend a lot of money to

do that—it is a pretty expensive situation—roof, landscape, ceiling, extra weight bearing, etc.

Mary Solada:Not to mention liability issue—I don't think they have rooftop gardens at any of their facilities.

Tim Hedges said there are balconies for the units that create an outdoor space. On the assisted living building, we always have an outdoor area for the memory care portion of it that is an enclosed, lattice, plexiglass that goes up high, curves in; there are pictures of those and the floor plan shows where that would be located. We do like to provide that type of amenity. We also have some pretty good site amenities—a gazebo, a resident garden, walking paths.

Leo noted that this is a tough site, but wanted further explanation of the actual clientele. Leo said he is familiar with the existing Sunrise facility here in Carmel that is licensed as nursing care. What would the proposed facility be licensed as?

Tim Hedges said the facility would be licensed as a residential care facility.

Susan Westermeier asked how the proposed facility would compare with the Sunrise facility on West 86th Street. Sue Also asked why the independent living building was chosen to be located along US 31 with the balcony view of US 31.

Tim Hedges said the facilities are similar—a similar level of care. There would be an assisted living component as well as a memory care component in its own, designated, secure area. Independent living is really not licensed. But, the building that backs up to 31 that has the walk-downs and balconies would be independent—the assisted, except for the memory care /special needs porch, would not have balconies—we would *never* put balconies in assisted living, but independent living—it would be entirely appropriate.

Tim Hedges explained that they were working more with the urban façade along 31, the interest that we could deliver with the balconies, with the walk-up, porch elements that are more consistent with the new urbanism theme that we were hearing—we just thought that was the most appropriate. From a grading standpoint, we could get our garage to work underneath the independent living building.

Jake Scott commented that the grading and the parking for the residents under the building lend itself to that use.

Susan Westermeier thought that the view was just not that nice.

Tim Hedges said that the assisted living building would look north to the Hampton Inn—there are other constraints having to do with parking and the façade along US 31—we thought this was the best way to go. This also provides underground parking in an easy way to access the independent living units.

Leo Dierckman thought it seemed like a tough site for the intended utilization—what drew the petitioner to this site—why not another site for consideration? There is some pretty high density

in this area—a lot of traffic—I never thought the petitioner would market based on traffic, drive-by, etc. This seems to be a transitional area and not the type of use I thought would go there.

Tim Hedges responded that they love transitional-types of uses—we like high traffic locations, believe it or not. Part of that is from a marketing perspective, the length of stay is three years and there is a certain amount of turnover—we like to be in a readily identifiable, easily accessible location. Typical retirement homes in the past were down “Shady Lane” at the end of a cul-de-sac. We have taken a complete 180 away from that; we don’t want our residents to feel “tucked-away” and isolated, we want them to feel that there is activity around them and they are part of an active community. People will sit on a porch and watch traffic go by. Believe it or not, this location is a very typical site for Sunrise, close to shopping and amenities, health care is nearby.

Leo Dierckman reiterated that it is a tough site—the mass of the building and dealing with some of the concerns from other people is maybe a result of dealing with a tough site for this kind of use. You need to achieve an outdoor sitting area so the residents can have some privacy.

Sue Westermeier commented that a sitting area around the pond would be good.

Tim Hedges responded that there is a front-entry sequence with a Gazebo sitting area, centralized, there are walking paths that go completely around the site, and the landscape plan provides for benches every 100 feet or so. There are sitting areas, bird houses/feeders, things to sit and look at, there is an outdoor resident garden plan—a lot of items very similar to other projects using outdoor amenities, walking paths, and sitting areas to accomplish that.

Mary Solada said it was her understanding that the focus is really to Old Meridian, not US 31.

Susan Westermeier responded that the petitioner would not even have to make that many changes to the US 31 side because it is US 31 and part of the office area. Susan really wanted to see changes to the “back side.” The changes on the US 31 side do not seem to be necessary—maybe necessary but not vital.

Tim Hedges said he didn’t necessarily disagree, but they were responding to feedback and that the US 31 corridor is important—we wanted to address that and the computer perspectives were targeted towards the US 31 corridor—the Meridian side to us—that is why we generated the computer renderings—to us, this is the project.

Susan Westermeier agreed and said that that is what people would see, the Old Meridian side, and that is what she would like to see changed to look more like some of the other pictures that are much more attractive—Lincoln Park—I would love to see some of that and it would fit in on the Old Meridian side, but you have not made those changes to that degree. What is presented does not seem to have the depth, the roundness, things that I like—it still looks kind of institutional. It is difficult, too, because these are sketches. I wish there was a way to see exactly what it is going to look like—is that do-able?

Kevin Heber said he understood that the rendering is not the exact final product but that it is

supposed to look similar.

Mary Solada said they would return to the next meeting with renderings from all perspectives.

Jake Scott said the new renderings would apply the changes suggested this evening and that they recognize the changes that need to be made.

Kevin Heber said that he did not like the ground floor—it is really intimidating—the super-high, three-story entrance, raised way above ground level—not so hung up on the roof.

Susan Westermeier noted that there is only so much ground to work with, and you maybe meet the letter of the law, but that she as well as Leo has a parent at Summer Trace—there is so much more green space, ponds, big seating areas in the back. It seems that other facilities owned by Sunrise don't have that much green space either—it seems like a lot of concrete and brick buildings.

Tim Hedges responded that they are trying to maximize those things, there are other facilities that have the luxury of more green space and it is a little different program. The amount of green space shown in this project is typical for a Sunrise site.

Susan Westermeier said there is nothing that really “pops out” as being very different. I would almost rather wait to see the new renderings—we need to make sure that the other members of the Committee as well as Carol Schleif see the revised drawings.

Leo Dierckman commented that unless the petitioner was going to do something on the roof that would look unique and different from the road, it seems it is totally up to the petitioner, since it would not impact us as citizens, especially if we can't see it and it is not an element or feature of the building—it is their decision.

Christine Holmes said the Department just wanted to make sure that there would be some sort of green space, although it may be part of the vegetable garden and atrium—we need more details on that.

Kevin Heber said he saw no point in the driveway shown.

Jake Scott said that was a good question and there have been projects in the past where the Fire Marshall has allowed for surface that does not require impervious paving. Jeff Scott said they may be “out of the loop” on that particular issue. The drive really isn't necessary other than they do require access all the way around the building. It raises another question, though. The gray area on the west side is down a bit from the road, US 31—particularly on the southwest side and there is a slight berm.

Leo Dierckman responded that even if the petitioner installed grass pavers through the strip and put “crash gates,” or something similar for the Fire Department to get through, it would be a big plus on green space.

Kevin Heber suggested widening the sidewalk on all sides—it looks like it is 5 feet. The massive stairs going to a little, 5-foot sidewalk seems “wrong.” If you are trying to foster a more social atmosphere—it might be something to investigate.

Tim Hedges thought those would be a more natural, patio area at the base of the stairs—put a barbecue in this area.

Susan asked if this was the same type of thing seen at Willow Lake, assisted living, they are more like a small bedroom for the person—they gather in the main area—they are not really apartments.

Tim Hedges confirmed Susan’s impression. The independent living would be more a typical apartment, a full kitchen, 700 to 1200 square feet. The assisted living units, “suites,” are not dwelling units by most definitions because there is no cooking facility in the rooms—residents are encouraged to take three meals/day in the common dining room. Frankly, from a safety standpoint, we don’t want a stove in those units—it is more like a master bedroom suite in your own home—private bathroom, your own sink, and a small refrigerator that is elevated off the floor. 40% of the common area is within the building, and while we want to allow for privacy, we also want to encourage socialization. The rooms are smaller, however. The Carrington facilities have a lot smaller units—much smaller than Sunrise—400 to 450 square feet is about average.

Kevin Heber asked how deep the balconies are—Jake Scott said they are 6.6 feet.

Sue Westermeier asked how many units have balconies—Jake Scott responded that it was close to 85% in the independent living.

Docket Nos. 07010009 DP/ADLS, 07020006 Zoning Waiver, Sunrise of Carmel were Continued to the March 29, 2007 Committee meeting. The petitioner was to furnish revisions as per the discussion and review this evening.

9. Docket No. 07030002 ADLS Amend: Dunkin Donuts at Carmel Walk

The applicant seeks approval for new facades, signage, and landscaping.

The site is located at 1305 S. Range Line Road and is zoned B8 and is within the Range Line Road Overlay.

Filed by Marsha Butkovich of Jeffery A. Scott Architects for Dunkin Donuts

Marsha Butkovich and Don Moore appeared before the Committee representing Dunkin Donuts. The site is within the Carmel Walk Center located at 1305 South Range Line Road.

Marsha Butkovich gave an overview of the proposal—this store will not be a typical Dunkin Donuts. The sign bumps out at the door and will no longer be a monolith with the name. The design will keep the existing brick, where there is wood will be EFIS in a color complimentary to the center. The entry element and drive-thru elements are brick to complement the building. The awning color is a toned-down orange—burnt orange and has more brown tones. The store front is new with enlarged windows.

There will be a drive-thru; the staff has suggested outdoor seating and the petitioner has agreed to accommodate. The rear of the drive and the rear of the building will be softened by curving and landscaping. The location of the drive-thru will be changed from the existing drive-thru on the south side of the building to the north side to better accommodate stacking spaces and pedestrians.

Christine Holmes said she worked closely with the petitioner prior to their official filing. The parapet that connects the former bank to the balance of the building will remain. There was a concern regarding the band of color along the top and the transition between the EFIS and T1-11, otherwise the Department recommends approval.

The Committee was generally impressed with the look of the new Dunkin Donuts store and the petitioner was very complimentary of Christine Holmes and the Department Staff who had taken time with them and made some really good suggestions in the design.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 07030002 ADLS Amend, Dunkin Donuts** at Carmel Walk, subject to the EFIS being continued across the breezeway and being dual color, seconded by Kevin Heber, **APPROVED** 3-0.

There was no further business to come before the Committee and the meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM.

Susan Westermeier, Acting Chairperson

Ramona Hancock, Secretary